

BBA Learning Assurance Committee Minutes of September 22, 2009

The minutes of the March 17, 2009 meeting of the BBA Learning Assurance were approved.

The March 22, 2009 meeting began at 12:30PM. In attendance were Raquel Benbunan-Fich, Bob Blau, Mike Carew, Ting Chen, John Choonoo, Maria DiBenedetto, Matthew Edwards, Mikhail Gershovich, Mehmet Genc, Lie-Fern Hsu, Samuel Johnson, Judy Tse, Vanessa Vacchiano, Ashok Vora, Gerd Welke, and Phyllis Zadra.

Although there have been no meetings of the full BBA Learning Assurance Committee, Phyllis assured the assembled members that there had been quite a lot of assessment activity in various arenas. In fact, we had collected the second round of data on oral communication, the baseline data for global awareness and that several of the departments had collected data for proficiency in a single discipline. At this meeting we reviewed the oral communication, global awareness and accountancy assessments.

Vanessa presented the oral communication data. One hundred and ten students were observed and assessed while giving their oral presentations in BPL. Once again we used teams of 3 to rate each student. The teams consisted of a Schwartz Communication consultant, a faculty volunteer (not the instructor in the class) and an executive volunteer. All of the evaluators were trained by Vanessa Vacchiano. The training sessions had the evaluators watch videotapes of BPL students' classes giving oral presentations. Each evaluator was asked to score the students independently according to the 12 criteria and the rubric provided. An open discussion of the each evaluator's scores and their rationale followed. This training was used to norm all of the evaluators and clarify the rubric where necessary.

Again, scores of 1 represented below expectations, 2 met expectations and 3 exceeded expectations. The results are attached. The analyses indicated that the overall mean for 11 of the 12 criteria was 2.00 or greater. The only area where the mean was below 2.00 was "was there too much reading of notes or slides". The mean for that subgoal was 1.98. The analysis indicated there are significant differences by ethnicity. Further analysis will pinpoint the specific areas of significance. There were not other significant differences based upon student demographic information. The 2009 data were compared with the oral communication results of 2006. There were improvements in each of the 12 criteria. Eight of the 12 criteria had significant improvements. Raquel and Bob Blau were among faculty evaluators for the oral assessment. Raquel indicated that it was a privilege to watch the students. She evaluated one of the honors sections. Bob indicated that he thought the student performances were generally very good, but that it was impossible to grade each of the 12 criteria (too many) while watching. He indicated that the classroom instructors were less impressed with the quality of the presentations since they were more sophisticated about the content of the material.

John Choonoo reported on the global awareness data. As you recall we used the Hot Shot case (thanks to Mehmet Genc). The case and the results are attached. The committee discussed the high percentage of students who met and exceeded expectations. In total fewer than 10% of the 90 students received overall scores that placed them below expectations. Mehmet indicated that there was a small pilot study completed earlier in the semester and based on those results the final directions to the Hot Shot case were amended to ask specific questions about political/legal; economic/financial; technological; and social/cultural issues relevant to the case. The rubric specified the number of issues that students needed to identify. It may be that the rubric was not rigorous enough. This issue will be discussed with the assessment professional to see if we should recalibrate the results. Each of the 90 papers was read by 3 evaluators (a Schwartz consultant, a faculty member and an executive). All the evaluators were trained on rubric prior to scoring. The rubric is attached. The papers were generated by students in several BPL sections. This was a take home assignment and extra credit was given for a sincere effort in responding to the prompt.

Vanessa discussed the results of the accounting assessment which satisfies the learning goal, proficiency in the major. The accounting assessment consisted of two parts, a multiple choice exam and a written assignment. Although the exam scores are presented according to our reporting rubric below expectations, met expectations and exceeded expectations, the focus of today's report will be on the written assignment since there is not complete clarity why certain exam score cutoffs were selected for each category. Additional information will be gathered about the exam and presented at the next meeting. With regard to the written task (attached), students had a take home assignment that asked them to write in Memo format an analysis of a questionable situation to the CFO. Two hundred and sixty-two papers were submitted. Again, three evaluators scored each paper according to the attached rubric. The evaluators were all trained prior to scoring any papers. The criteria included following appropriate memo format, clear writing style and appropriate content. Students on average scored 2.07 and 2.00 on writing style and content. Student scores were lower on following memo format, a skill that is not formally taught anywhere in our curriculum. When looking at the demographic information of the students who completed the writing assessment there were significant differences between white/non-hispanic students and asian/pacific islander students with the former group performing better in the category of writing style. Likewise the writing style of CUNY SC transfers and outside CUNY transfers was significantly better than CUNY CC transfer students.

Raquel followed up on some of the important issues that were revealed in our pilot test of technological skills. Based on that assessment it is clear that the follow up assessment needs to be limited to no more than 200 students and a template needs to be provided. We are currently looking for a mechanism that would allow automated scoring of the assignment. We will look into the possibility of loading the assignment into specific labs and having classes do that assignment in the lab. The hope is that we will have an assignment selected later this semester so we can complete the assessment in spring 2010.

Phyllis provided the committee with an update of the assessment activities from March 17, 2009 through September 17, 2009. The update is attached.

Since there will be a number of other assessments results analyzed in the next several weeks it was agreed that the committee should meet in about a month's time. Phyllis agreed to send out the next meeting date shortly.

The meeting was adjourned at 2PM.